



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Knapp's in his *Spanish Reader*, but it has never been taken seriously by any one else, and does not deserve to be resuscitated after Todd's review of Knapp's 'Etymologies,' MOD. LANG. NOTES, i, col. 285.—l. 1908. What is the purpose of a note on *païrez*, when the text (and so also the édition définitive) reads *païerez?*—l. 2196. Since good vigorous renderings of words like *pardieu* are forbidden by our laws of taste, would it not be better to omit the translation altogether rather than render it by the colorless *sounds*?

The following typographical errors were noted: p. v, l. 7, omit the comma between *master* and *mind*; p. 8 l. 1, change *hâton* to *hâtons*; l. 782 change *qu* to *qui*; l. 786 put a period after *Prions*; l. 861 change *Blesse* to *Blessé*; l. 1055 place an exclamation point after *Il a les nègres*; l. 1175 note the imperfect letter-press after *d'Harcourt*; l. 1200 the numeral stands a line too high; l. 1757 the édition définitive also writes *pâtenôtres*, but Littré, s. v., omits the first circumflex; the word appears correctly in the note; l. 2116 change *reste* to *rester*. In note 554 change *bon homme* to *bonhomme*. Note 1862, change *filius* to *filius*, or better omit altogether this part of the note. In the Appendix, act V, scène ii, l. 6, change *traître* to *traitre*.

In conclusion let it be said once more, that this edition is in every way a scholarly piece of work and a most welcome addition to our available text-books.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

#### ON THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE:

*Illustrations of how it is taught in a Much-Advertised Book, with a Few Critical Remarks.*

Now that so much has been written (in *The Dial* and elsewhere) on the subject of how English is taught in colleges and universities, it may not be amiss to say something about how it is taught or ought to be taught in the secondary schools. I shall not attempt to treat the subject generally or exhaustively, but merely throw out a few hints in connec-

tion with criticisms of a book to which I recently gave some attention.

I refer to Lockwood's *Lessons in English*, a book which has been widely recommended for use in high schools and academies, and is mentioned in some University catalogues among the books to be studied in preparing for entrance to these institutions. During the past summer I had occasion to use the book with a class of High-School Principals, and not finding it to be in all respects as excellent a work as I had been led to suppose, but that, on the contrary, it suffers from very grave defects, I have thought it worth while to point out some of these, the more so because the book is designed for use in secondary schools.

Of all text-books those intended for young students need to be the most carefully prepared, as to both contents and style. The book in question, however, cannot be said to fulfill these requirements. It is faulty not only as regards proportion and the selection of topics, but also in logic and grammar.

The book is "adapted to the study of American classics," and the greater part of it,—the introduction, containing suggestions on how to teach literature, and the chapters on rhetoric, composition, and biographical sketches,—is on the whole good. But the first chapter, which purports to be a history of the English language, deserves very little if any praise. It seems remarkable that the book has been so long before the public without being severely criticised in the matter of this chapter. The explanation is, perhaps, that those who may be the most competent to judge do not as a rule use the book in their classes. Instead of giving a comprehensive and connected history of the English language, which might have been done in a simple and interesting way, the author has prepared a chapter of scraps, which give it the character of a crazy quilt. Evidently the author has no thorough knowledge of the subject, not even enough to use discretion in the choice of authorities. Only on this supposition can one account for the many erroneous, not to say absurd, statements to be found in this chapter. A full criticism of all these shall of course not be attempted here.

Throughout the chapter the names "Saxon,"

"Anglo-Saxon," "Old English," and "English" are, without any good reason, used interchangeably. For example, on page 17 the author says that, "in time the dialect of the West Saxons became the language of literature and of law. This is what is known as *Old English*. Thus it happens that the language of the Teutonic invaders is called sometimes *the Anglo-Saxon*, sometimes *the Saxon*, and sometimes *the English*." Here "Old English" and "Anglo-Saxon" are used as convertible terms for the language of one and the same period. But on the very next page, where the author gives specimens of the Lord's Prayer in Old English and Middle English, the first is called "Anglo-Saxon" and the second "Old English."

About two pages are given to the subject of "Theories Concerning the Origin of Language" and "Theories Concerning the Beginnings of Speech." These theories are merely stated, not enough being said to enable the student to form any intelligent idea as to which of the theories is the most reasonable; yet in the questions for review (p. 34) the pupil is asked not only to state what these theories are, but also to tell which he adopts, and why. The subject of the theories concerning the origin of language and the beginnings of speech is of little practical importance and lies far above the capacity of most High-School pupils. It belongs rather in a special course for advanced students in a college or a university. To introduce such theories into an elementary course for young pupils, and, still more, to expect these to be able intelligently to adopt or reject one or another of them, is, to say the least, not a sign of much pedagogical wisdom. Young students cannot have or obtain knowledge enough on so difficult and abstract a subject to be able to say, with deliberation, that they accept or reject one or another theory with regard to it, and it is foolish to put such questions to any class of students except those of mature age.

Equally out of place in an elementary course are scraps of comparative philology picked from various sources and tacked together with little or no connection. Nearly a page, for example, is given to show the peculiarities of Semitic inflection, though there is hardly any-

thing to illustrate Indo-European inflection. A paragraph on the latter, showing that the various languages of the Indo-European family are all essentially alike in their inflectional system, would have been both instructive and interesting.

In the classification of the Indo-European languages there are several mistakes and omissions. Old Slavonic and Bulgarian are given as different languages, whereas the one is derived from the other; and Servian, Moravian, Slovakian, and other languages belonging to the Slavonic branch, are omitted. Old Prussian, an extinct language, is mentioned, but not Lithuanian and Lettish, which are still spoken. Scandinavian is put in between High Germanic and Low Germanic, whereas these two ought to be mentioned together, and Old Saxon, Frisian, Middle English, Modern English, Flemish, and other languages of the group, are omitted. Among the Celtic languages, Erse is not mentioned; but a few pages farther on, where forms of the word *father* in the various Indo-European languages are given, the Erse form occurs, though there is no explanation of the meaning of "Erse." In the same place (p. 10) *vatar* and *fader* are given as the Gothic and Dutch forms of this word; they should be respectively *fadar* and *vader*.

"In the Middle Ages the Arabs . . . . gradually brought under their dominion . . . . the countries of Southern Europe, forming the most powerful Semitic kingdom that has ever existed."

This would mean that the Arabs conquered not only Spain but also Italy and the Balkan Peninsula, to say nothing of other "countries in Southern Europe;" whereas the truth is that the Arabs gained permanent possession only of Spain. The Balkan Peninsula was not brought under Mohammedan rule till near the end of the Middle Ages, and then not under the rule of Semites but of Turks. Furthermore, the empire founded by the followers of Mohammed was never called a kingdom, and it soon split up into several parts, Spain being the first to separate from the unwieldy body.

On page 11 the statement is made that the attention of the Romans was first called to

Britain "about fifty-five years before Christ, when Julius Caesar was conquering the Celtic tribes in Spain and Gaul." Caesar had not for many years been in Spain at this time, but had been exclusively occupied with the conquest of Gaul. Then follows a passage on the early Britons, which is much too long, as the book is not a history of the peoples that have lived in England, but an elementary text-book on language, composition, rhetoric, and literature. In such a book an account of how the stones were placed in the ancient Druidic monuments at Carnac and Stonehenge is entirely out of place.

On page 13 is found the remark that "not more than a dozen Latin words were left by the Romans," and a few lines farther on (p.14) occurs the conflicting statement that "not more than one hundred Latin words have been added to the language by the five centuries of Roman rule."

On page 18 after giving the Lord's Prayer in Old English and in the version of Wyclif, the author adds that "it is interesting to notice how the Saxon tongue gradually changed in form, and how our modern English has improved upon the style of the first English translation of the Bible." One would like to have the author point out wherein "our modern English has improved upon the style of the first English translation of the Bible," a task which might prove somewhat difficult. Surely High-School pupils who have no knowledge of Old English cannot decide which of the two versions is superior in style.

Among the gods worshiped by the Teutonic invaders of Britain is mentioned Seterne, "of whom little is known except the name." Seterne is the Old-English form of Saturnus, after whom Saturday is named. He was not one of the Teutonic gods, and was not worshiped by the Teutons.

On page 21 the author says the Scandinavians who invaded England "lived in the southern part of Denmark, in part of Norway and Sweden, and in the very countries from which the English had come." It would be interesting to know what people lived in the northern part of Denmark, whether these were not Scandinavians also. The sentence illustrates the carelessness and indefiniteness pervading

the whole chapter. Farther down the same page the author says, "The Danes, it must be remembered, belonged to the same Teutonic race with the Saxons." From this the beginner has the right to infer that there were several Teutonic races, and that the Danes and the Saxons together belonged to one of these.

The leaders of the Scandinavian pirates who ravaged the coasts of England, France, and other countries, were not called Vikings, as we are told on page 22. This name was applied to all who engaged in such expeditions. The leaders were called Sea-kings.

"When the Normans had lived in France about one hundred years . . . . . their speech was more refined" than that of the English. This is an old assumption for which there is probably no ground. English had been cultivated as a literary language for about four centuries before the Norman Conquest, probably still longer; its grammar was rich in inflections and stable; it had developed a simple, clear, and vigorous prose style, hardly surpassed since, and a poetic form of no mean excellence; and it possessed a respectable literature both in prose and verse, which is still worth studying. With the possible exception of Icelandic (Old Norse), English was then the most cultivated vernacular language in Western Europe. The Romance languages, which are all derived from some variety of the Vulgar Latin (the *Lingua Romana Rustica*), had hardly assumed a stable form as yet, and literature was only just beginning in France, hardly anything worthy of the name having been composed in it before the middle of the eleventh century. The statement that Norman-French was superior to and more refined than English as spoken and written at the time of the Conquest, is an old one which will continue in one form or another to disfigure text-books on English until it becomes more common to learn something at first hand of the English language and literature before the Norman Conquest. It may then dawn upon the minds of some who now think otherwise, that the Old English (or Anglo-Saxon) was a rich and cultivated language, and that the effect upon it of the Norman Conquest was to impoverish it, and not, as is

commonly believed, to enrich it. That some centuries later, after it had been degraded and impoverished, and its grammar had become corrupt, it borrowed largely from the Norman-French and other sources to make up for what it had lost, is quite another matter.

"The greatest effect of the Norman Conquest upon the language was that it introduced the habit of borrowing words from other languages" (p. 26). This habit was already in vogue before the Conquest, a large number of words having been borrowed from Greek and Latin. The effect of the Norman Conquest upon the English Language was that the latter ceased to be a language of the ruling class, those who spoke it being deprived of nearly all the influential positions both in Church and State; that it was less cultivated as a literary language; and that, being thereby deprived of the conservative influence of literature, it became subject as never before to the processes of growth and decay, so that in one century after the Conquest it changed more than it had done in the four centuries preceding. The grammar was thrown into hopeless confusion, most of the old inflections being gradually lost, and hundreds of words were dropped and replaced by French words. Finally, after the loss of most of their French possessions, the Normans and the English began to amalgamate; the Normans learned to speak the language they had before despised; and in the fourteenth century, when so great an author as Chaucer chose to write in it rather than in French, the English language again attained the position it had lost at the time of the Conquest. But it was now a very different language; the rich inflections of the Old English period had almost entirely disappeared, and the vocabulary was nearly half French.

The criticism was made that the book is faulty in logic. An example or two will suffice. "Julius Caesar did not succeed in conquering the warlike Britons, although for nearly five centuries after his invasion the Romans regarded Britannia as one of their provinces" (p. 12). If, instead of the second, the first of these clauses began with "although," the sentence would have some meaning; but even then it would state only a half-

truth. The Romans not only regarded Britain as one of their provinces, but they actually conquered it, the conquest being begun in the reign of Claudius and finished in the reign of Domitian.

"As the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes mingled more and more, great changes became apparent in their form of speech, and in time the dialect of the West Saxons became the language of literature and of law. This is what is known as *Old English*. Thus it happens that the language of the Teutonic invaders is called sometimes *the Anglo-Saxon*, sometimes *the Saxon*, and sometimes *the English*" (p. 17).

The first sentence of this passage is meaningless. West Saxon became the literary language because the West Saxons became politically the dominant tribe in England, not because of changes that became apparent in consequence of the mingling of the various tribes. In the last sentence "thus" has nothing to refer to. We are not told how or why "the language of the Teutonic invaders is called sometimes *the Anglo-Saxon*, sometimes *the Saxon*, and sometimes *the English*."

On page 29 occurs the surprising statement that "the English-speaking people are familiar with most of the other languages spoken in the world." The truth is that the English-speaking people, like other peoples, are familiar with no language but their own, and that most of them do not even know that very well. Perhaps this goes without saying; but in books for the young, one looks for more guarded statements.

Upon the whole, the first chapter of Lockwood's *Lessons in English* is as ill-proportioned and careless in style as anything I have ever met with in a text-book. Only a few of the many mistakes have been noticed, and yet it is time to bring these remarks to a close. Before doing so, however, I must substantiate my other charge, that the book also suffers from grammatical mistakes. Two such are found on page 71, in the questions, "What are [*sic*] represented by the birds and butterflies?" and "What are meant by the pebbles?"

ALBERT E. EGGE.

State University of Iowa.